

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

HANDBOOK FOR APPRAISAL AND EVALUATION

OF FOREIGN SERVICE REPORTING

NOVEMBER 1958

State Dept. review completed

PREPARED BY

DIVISION OF INTELLIGENCE COLLECTION AND DISTRIBUTION,  
OFFICE OF INTELLIGENCE RESOURCES AND COORDINATION

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. APPRAISAL OF INDIVIDUAL DESPATCHES.....	2
A. Who Selects Despatches for Appraisal.....	2
1. Analysts.....	2
2. Requirements Staff.....	2
3. Posts.....	2
4. Division of Records Management.....	2
B. Despatches to be Appraised.....	2
C. What to Include in Appraisals.....	3
D. Security Classification of Appraisals.....	3
E. Distribution of Completed Appraisals.....	3
F. Statistics.....	4
III. EVALUATION OF JOINT WEEKKA REPORTING.....	5
IV. EVALUATION OF CIA REPORTS.....	6
V. ANNUAL END-USER SUMMARY REPORTS.....	7
A. Purpose of Summaries.....	7
B. Periods Covered in End-User Summaries.....	7
C. Narrative Comment and Numerical Rating.....	7
D. Reporting Officers to be Rated.....	7
E. Statistics.....	8
VI. ICD'S ANNUAL EVALUATION OF FOREIGN SERVICE REPORTING.....	9
A. Preparation.....	9
1. Written Statements by Analysts.....	9
2. Comments by Desk Officers.....	9
3. Comments by Foreign Reporting Staff (REP).....	9
B. Purposes Served by the Annual Evaluation.....	9
C. Distribution of the Annual Evaluation.....	10
VII. INSPECTORS' BRIEFING BOOK CONTRIBUTIONS .....	11
VIII. CONCLUSIONS.....	12
APPENDIX A - References.....	13
APPENDIX B - Recipients of Annual Evaluation of Foreign Service Reporting...	14

## I - INTRODUCTION

The Division of Intelligence Collection and Distribution (ICD) assists intelligence research analysts in the Bureau of Intelligence and Research (INR) in the program of appraisals, evaluations, end-user summaries, and contributions for the Inspectors' Briefing Books. This handbook has been prepared to provide analysts with a basic guide for this program.

The Requirements Staff of ICD coordinates all phases of the program described in this handbook with the exception of Section III, Evaluation of Joint Weeka Reporting and Section IV, Evaluation of CIA Reports.

The following definitions are essential to understand the various phases of this activity:

Appraisal. This term is used to describe the analysis by one end-user of one despatch or occasionally a series of related despatches.

Evaluation. This term is applied to the study and review of a post's overall reporting for a period of time, usually a year.

End-Users. This term designates officers who receive despatches for use in their work on policy formation, intelligence, production and the like.

Several circulars and regulations which bear on the appraisal and evaluation program are listed in Appendix A of this handbook. All of these regulations and circulars are designed to stimulate the flow of an increasing number of appraisals and evaluations.

Political and economic reporting officers in the field are keenly interested in knowing whether the information they have provided is adequate, and whether it has served a useful purpose. They welcome comments on the validity of their interpretations, and are assisted by brief expositions of contrary views. Constructive and guiding criticism serves to improve the quality of their reports.

Reporting officers have told Foreign Service Inspectors that they appreciate receiving indications that their reports are read, evaluated, and used. Inspectors are on record in favor of a larger volume of appraisals.

Many offices in Washington are dependent upon Foreign Service reporting, yet the reporting officer may not know of an office's work or needs. Frequent appraisals can bring home to the reporting officer the function and needs of the Bureau of Intelligence and Research (INR) and its particular areas of interest.

~~OFFICIAL USE ONLY~~

2

## II - APPRAISAL OF INDIVIDUAL DESPATCHES

### A. Who Selects Despatches for Appraisal

1. Analysts. Analysts have an obligation to select despatches from their areas of responsibility for appraisal. Enough time should be allocated each week to select and appraise one or two Foreign Service despatches.
2. Requirements Staff. Officers of the Requirements Staff select despatches and send them to IRA analysts under cover of memoranda asking for appraisals. This is merely a stimulant or a supplement since research officers alone possess the substantive knowledge upon which to make more meaningful selections.
3. Posts. Posts may request the appraisal of individual despatches in accordance with 4 FSM 266 for political reports and under 3 FSM 062.22 for economic reports.
4. Division of Records Management. Certain economic despatches received in answer to CERP requirements are stamped "Appraisal Requested" by the Division of Records Management (RM). (See 3 FSM 062.21). However, analysts should not avoid appraising despatches because they are not so stamped, especially if they meet the criteria described below.

### B. Despatches to be Appraised

Although certain economic despatches (see Section II, A, 4 above) are selected for appraisal by RM according to a pattern established by the Foreign Reporting Staff (REP), no fixed pattern has been devised for political despatches. In general, however, it is desirable to appraise all economic or political despatches of more than routine nature. In this category are included despatches which (1) report important events, (2) present analyses of trends, or (3) indicate initiative or a large expenditure of time on the part of the reporting officer.

A goal that analysts may strive for is the appraisal of despatches from all posts and all reporting officers. If achieved, this would not only help to promote a more effective reporting program, but would serve to provide the analyst with more material and fuller coverage upon which to base his contributions to the Annual Evaluation, the Inspectors' Briefing Books, and the Annual End-User Summaries.

The question is sometimes asked whether end-users in the Bureau of Intelligence and Research (INR) should make critical appraisals of poor despatches. Inspectors have stated that not to do so is a disservice both to the reporting officer and to the Department. Foreign Service reporting can be improved if reporting officers are informed of the steps they must take to make their efforts complete, accurate, and easily comprehensible. Accordingly, deficient as well as commendatory reporting should be clearly and tactfully pointed out by end-users.

~~OFFICIAL USE ONLY~~

### C. What to Include in Appraisals

The end-user appraising a political report may use Form DS-1025, Foreign Service Political Reporting Appraisal, (see Exhibit No. 1). His comments, expressed freely and informally, should be constructive and chosen primarily to aid the reporting officer in improving the material he transmits to INR and the Department. The appraisal should point out whether the report was well-written, accurate, easily comprehensible, how it was helpful and which qualities made it interesting. The form has a check list for the guidance of the analyst in making his appraisal. Also, the analyst's copy of the form contains a numerical scale, from 1 to 6, which corresponds roughly to the numerical ratings used on efficiency and end-user summary reports. By giving each despatch appraised a numerical rating, the analyst can more easily determine the over-all numerical ratings of reporting officers' work when preparing the Annual End-User Summary Reports.

Appraisals of economic reports are prepared on Form DS-509, Foreign Service Economic Reporting Appraisal (see Exhibit No. 2), which contains a check list to serve as a guide in formulating comment in the narrative section.

Although appraisals are not to be used in place of instructions, or as a means of levying requirements on a post, analysts might keep in mind that their appraisals will have the effect of indicating to the field the subjects and topics in which they have an interest. However, requests for reporting should be transmitted by Department of State Instructions. Occasionally, reports are so outstanding that a commendatory appraisal of them may take the form of a Departmental Instruction.

### D. Security Classification of Appraisals

The classification of an appraisal (other than of a telegram) shall apply to its content and not to the classification of the document appraised. (See also RP 190.) Appraisals classified SECRET or higher must be serialized (RP 192).

### E. Distribution of Completed Appraisals

Appraisals of individual political or economic despatches prepared by IRA or other end-users are returned to the Requirements Staff for review and distribution. Distribution of political appraisals normally consists of the original and one copy to the post, a copy to the end-user who prepared the appraisal, a copy to the regional bureau desk officer, and a copy for the files of the Requirements Staff.

Appraisals of economic reports are forwarded to the Foreign Reporting Staff (REP) for ultimate transmission to the field. Two copies are retained in INR (one in IRA and one in the Requirements Staff files). REP, however, does not distribute or transmit to the field the appraisals of economic reporting from USSR and European satellites (with the exception of Yugoslavia; these are transmitted by the Requirements Staff of ICD).

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Exhibit No. 1

FORM DS-1025 5-15-58		DEPARTMENT OF STATE		Security Classification of Appraisal	
<b>FOREIGN SERVICE POLITICAL REPORTING APPRAISAL</b>					
TO (Post)				DATE OF APPRAISAL	
DESPATCH NUMBER		SUBJECT			
DATED					
AUTHOR			CONTRIBUTORS		
<i>These comments do not necessarily represent the views of all agencies concerned. Nothing in this document should be construed as instructional material or as altering outstanding instructions.</i>					
<b>REPORT WOULD HAVE BEEN OF GREATER VALUE TO US IF IT HAD:</b>					
<input type="checkbox"/> Drawn conclusions and made recommendations					
<input type="checkbox"/> Adequately presented conflicting viewpoints					
<input type="checkbox"/> Indicated and evaluated sources of information					
<input type="checkbox"/> Been received earlier					
<input type="checkbox"/> Been more thorough					
<input type="checkbox"/> Been more concise and better organized					
<b>REPORT IS COMMENDABLE FOR ITS:</b>					
<input type="checkbox"/> Timeliness					
<input type="checkbox"/> Display of alertness and initiative					
<input type="checkbox"/> Display of resourcefulness					
<input type="checkbox"/> Thoroughness					
<input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensiveness					
<input type="checkbox"/> Clarity					
<input type="checkbox"/> Good organization					
<input type="checkbox"/> Interpretation and Analysis					
<input type="checkbox"/> Objectivity					
<input type="checkbox"/> Conclusions or recommendations					
<input type="checkbox"/> Contributions to basic or current intelligence needs					
<input type="checkbox"/> Use of other United States field sources of information					
<b>COMMENT:</b>					
Security Classification of Appraisal		APPRAISING AGENCY, BUREAU, OR OFFICE		APPRAISING OFFICER	

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FORM DS-509 Rev. 3-1-53		DEPARTMENT OF STATE		Security Classification of Appraisal	
<b>FOREIGN SERVICE ECONOMIC REPORTING APPRAISAL</b>					
TO (Post)				DATE OF APPRAISAL	
<b>INFORMAL COMMENTS ON DESPATCH:</b>					
NUMBER		ENTITLED			
DATED					
AUTHOR		CONTRIBUTORS			
These comments do not necessarily represent the views of all agencies concerned. Nothing in this document should be construed as instructional material or as altering outstanding instructions.					
To appraising officer: The following check list may serve as a guide. Check only those items <i>applicable</i> to the report being appraised.					
<b>REPORT WOULD HAVE BEEN OF GREATER VALUE TO US IF IT HAD</b> (Explain why below):					
<input type="checkbox"/> 1. Followed more closely applicable instructions.					
<input type="checkbox"/> 2. Related subject matter to other economic or political factors.					
<input type="checkbox"/> 3. More fully emphasized relation of subject matter to U.S. interests.					
<input type="checkbox"/> 4. Analyzed trends and anticipated future problems.					
<input type="checkbox"/> 5. Drawn conclusions and made recommendations.					
<input type="checkbox"/> 6. Adequately presented conflicting viewpoints.					
<input type="checkbox"/> 7. Indicated sources of information.					
<input type="checkbox"/> 8. Evaluated sources of information.					
<input type="checkbox"/> 9. Not duplicated what was previously reported or available through other channels.					
<input type="checkbox"/> 10. Been received earlier.					
<input type="checkbox"/> 11. Been more thorough and comprehensive.					
<input type="checkbox"/> 12. Been more concise.					
<input type="checkbox"/> 13. Been better organized.					
<input type="checkbox"/> 14. Reconciled discrepancies in statistical data.					
<b>REPORT IS COMMENDABLE FOR ITS:</b>					
<input type="checkbox"/> 15. Timeliness, or display of alertness and initiative.					
<input type="checkbox"/> 16. Thoroughness, detail or adherence to applicable instructions.					
<input type="checkbox"/> 17. Analysis or interpretation.					
<input type="checkbox"/> 18. Conclusions and recommendations.					
<input type="checkbox"/> 19. Objectivity.					
<input type="checkbox"/> 20. Clarity and good organization.					
<i>Full and constructive comment will serve to improve the standard of Foreign Service reporting by assisting the reporters in supplying material (within the scope of instructions) of greatest value to you.</i>					
<b>COMMENT</b> (For more space use Form DS-509a - Continuation Sheet):					
Security Classification of Appraisal		APPRAISING AGENCY, BUREAU, OR OFFICE:		APPRAISING OFFICER:	

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

4

F. Statistics

The following statistics show the volume of INR appraisals (by calendar year):

	<u>1955</u>	<u>1956</u>	<u>1957</u>
Political Appraisals	130	207	560
Economic Appraisals	63	218	450
Total Appraisals	193	425	1010

Divided by research divisions within the Bureau of Intelligence and Research, these figures are as follows (by calendar year):

	<u>1955</u>		<u>1956</u>		<u>1957</u>	
	<u>Political</u>	<u>Economic</u>	<u>Political</u>	<u>Economic</u>	<u>Political</u>	<u>Economic</u>
DRA	6	10	6	52	97	111
DRF	39	26	37	41	148	87
DRN	21	15	81	44	194	101
DRS	22	5	62	14	59	46
DRW	12	7	15	54	58	71
DFI	1	0	0	13	2	33
BI	29	-	6	-	3	-

These statistics show that the number of appraisals is increasing substantially. Yet they represent only a very small percentage of the total number of despatches which should be appraised under the general criteria set forth in Section II, B above. It has been estimated, for example, that if each analyst were to appraise 2 despatches monthly, the total annual number of appraisals would more than triple the present volume.

OFFICIAL USE ONLY



### III - EVALUATION OF JOINT WEEKA REPORTING

Posts participating in the Joint Weeka reporting program seek to provide Departmental and other end-users with a coordinated and integrated picture of significant political, military and psychological developments in their countries in the form of a concise and jointly prepared interpretative commentary.

Instructions for the preparation of a Joint Weeka are set forth in 4 FSM 931. Joint Weeka reporting is evaluated by Washington end-users once a year.

ICD's Military Liaison Branch is the coordinating unit in the evaluation of Joint Weeka reporting. The Military Liaison Branch requests evaluative comments from the Department's regional bureaus and INR, the Department of the Army (ACSI), the Department of the Navy (ONI), the Department of the Air Force (AFOIN), the Central Intelligence Agency and the United States Information Agency. These comments are then coordinated and transmitted in the form of an instruction to the post concerned.

INR analysts are asked to comment primarily on the political section of the Joint Weeka and are encouraged to consider the following factors in making their evaluation:

- a. Selection of subjects
- b. Adequacy of post comments
- c. Adequacy of contributions by participating units
- d. Format
- e. Continuity of reporting of an event when required
- f. Presentation - whether concise and clear
- g. Timeliness of reporting
- h. Suggestions for improvement

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

#### IV - EVALUATION OF CIA REPORTS

The CIA Liaison Branch of the Division of Intelligence Collection and Distribution coordinates the program of evaluation of CIA reports within the Department.

The term "evaluation" has a different connotation for the Central Intelligence Agency than for the Department. As applied to a CIA report, an evaluation is a short, critical commentary on the value of a given report in terms of accuracy, value of contents, importance of information and utility in view of what is known, believed, surmised or needed in Washington.

CIA depends principally on the Department for evaluation of its reports. The evaluations requested of the Department are of two types: (1) those desired for single reports, and (2) those requested for groups of reports. Evaluations are requested, customarily, on those CIA reports which represent raw rather than finished intelligence.

Evaluations of CIA reports should be made on the forms attached to those reports on which an evaluation is requested. These forms are divided into 4 parts (see Exhibit No. 3). The first of these contains 17 boxes with comments, the use of which is intended to simplify the analyst's task and conserve his time. It is important that appropriate boxes be checked for all reports evaluated.

The second part of the evaluation form provides space for CIA to address specific questions to the analyst. CIA reports officers have been given the following advice: "(a) If you want more than checkmarks on evaluation forms, ask questions, and (b) if you want really useful reactions, frame your questions so that the analyst can cover your needs with minimum effort".

The third part of the form is for the analyst's comments on the report. Short explanations of the checks in the first part enhance the usefulness of the evaluation. Some evaluations require considerable analysis, but the majority can be disposed of satisfactorily within a few minutes.

The last part of the form is included in order to provide the analyst with an opportunity further to exploit the source for the Department's particular intelligence needs; it also permits the analyst, as end-user, to focus CIA's collection effort in other related directions.

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Exhibit No. 3

☐ TOP SECRET☐ SECRET☐ CONFIDENTIAL

INDIVIDUAL INFORMATION REPORT EVALUATION		DATE FORWARDED	
TO: (Evaluating Agency)		REPORT NO.	
FROM: CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY		FIELD NO.	
PLEASE COMPLETE THIS FORM AND RETAIN THE ORIGINAL, IF DESIRED. TO PROVIDE MAXIMUM VALUE AND TIMELY GUIDANCE TO THE COLLECTOR OF THIS INFORMATION, EVALUATORS ARE REQUESTED TO RETURN THE MASTER TO THEIR CIA LIAISON OFFICER BY THE FOLLOWING DATE:			
[I] VALUE OF THIS REPORT		IMPORTANCE OF RECEIVING FURTHER REPORTS ON THIS SPECIFIC SUBJECT	
<input type="checkbox"/> 1. FILLS A PRIORITY NEED		<input type="checkbox"/> 1. OF SPECIAL IMPORTANCE	
<input type="checkbox"/> 2. OF CONSIDERABLE VALUE		<input type="checkbox"/> 2. OF CONSIDERABLE IMPORTANCE	
<input type="checkbox"/> 3. OF VALUE		<input type="checkbox"/> 3. OF IMPORTANCE	
<input type="checkbox"/> 4. OF SLIGHT OR NO VALUE		<input type="checkbox"/> 4. OF SLIGHT IMPORTANCE	
<input type="checkbox"/> 5. ALREADY SUFFICIENTLY KNOWN		<input type="checkbox"/> 5. NO INTEREST; NO FURTHER DISSEMINATION DESIRED ON THIS SUBJECT	
<input type="checkbox"/> 6. NO DATA PERMITTING ASSESSMENT			
(PLEASE EXPLAIN BASIS FOR YOUR EVALUATION IN SECTION III BELOW)			
[II] COLLECTOR'S QUESTIONS TO EVALUATOR			
[III] EVALUATOR'S COMMENTS (Use additional sheets as necessary)			
[IV] EVALUATOR'S FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS, OR GUIDANCE TO COLLECTOR ON SUBJECT OF THIS REPORT (Note: Unless formal requirement is to follow, collection of information in reply to questions on this evaluation sheet will be undertaken only as convenient or available.)			
FORMAL REQUIREMENT IS BEING FORWARDED	SIGNATURE		DIVISION
FORMAL REQUIREMENT IS NOT BEING FORWARDED			DATE

☐ TOP SECRET☐ SECRET☐ CONFIDENTIAL

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

## V - ANNUAL END-USER SUMMARY REPORTS

### A. Purpose of Summaries

The Requirements Staff requests end-users in INR to evaluate the total reporting effort of all political and economic reporting officers once each year. These evaluations are prepared on Form DS-973, Annual End-User Summary Report. The reverse side of Form DS-973 contains an explanation of its purpose and suggestions for filling it out (see Exhibit No. 4). Since individual appraisals are not included in an officer's file and the summary is, it is important that all reporting officers be rated.

### B. Periods Covered in End-User Summaries

The period covered in end-user summaries is roughly the fiscal year for Foreign Service officers and Foreign Service Reserve officers. For Foreign Service staff officers the period is from December 1 through November 30. End-users must complete their summaries prior to June 15 for Foreign Service officers and Foreign Service Reserve officers, and prior to December 1 for Foreign Service staff officers.

### C. Narrative Comment and Numerical Rating

The annual end-user summary report contains space for discussion of various factors including quality, scope and quantity of work, initiative and resourcefulness demonstrated, and usability or appropriateness of the effort. This narrative comment should correspond as closely as possible to the over-all numerical rating selected by the end-user. Numerical ratings are in 6 levels, (from one to 6) and the standards for each level are explained on the form. It is suggested that each summary be read by the branch chief and the division chief, if possible, before transmission to the Requirements Staff. The completed summaries are forwarded to PER by the Requirements Staff in time to be considered, together with other reports in the officers' personnel files, by the appropriate Selection Boards.

### D. Reporting Officers to be Rated

The Requirements Staff compiles an unofficial list of as many Foreign Service reporting officers as it can identify, arranged by geographic areas, to aid end-users in INR. End-users are asked to report on the officers listed and on all others who have submitted a sufficient volume of despatches during the course of the year. The cooperation of the end-users is essential to obtain end-user summary reports on all reporting officers.

FORM DS-973 8-1-52		DEPARTMENT OF STATE <b>ANNUAL END-USER SUMMARY REPORT</b>	
OFFICER REPORTED ON		CLASS	POST
REVIEWING DEPARTMENT OR BUREAU	<b>PERIOD COVERED</b>		DATE SUBMITTED
	FROM	TO	
 <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"><div>(Signature of Reviewing Official)</div><div>(Functional Title of Reviewing Official)</div></div>			
<b>PLEASE FOLLOW INSTRUCTIONS ON REVERSE SIDE OF FORM</b>			
A. TYPE OF WORK OR ACTIVITY UNDER REVIEW			
B. EVALUATION OF WORK PRODUCT OR ACTIVITY			
C. RATING			
i      2      3      4      5      6			

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Exhibit No. 4 (p. 2)

### POLICY

Annual End-User Summary Evaluations are required at the time annual efficiency reports are due and normally cover a period of approximately one year. The report should cover, in summary form, the End-User's evaluation of the performance or work product of the officer or employee as measured and observed during that period. If it is desired to submit comments on individual reports or actions, such reports should be submitted in memorandum form.

### PURPOSE

It is the purpose of this form to provide the Department of State with End-User evaluations of the performance of individual officers and employees of the Foreign Service to be considered along with their annual efficiency reports and other evidence of record in arriving at an over-all evaluation of their performance during the period covered by the rating.

### INSTRUCTIONS

#### A. *Type of Work or Activity Being Reviewed.*

Specify the exact type of reporting, work product, or activity on which the report is based.

#### B. *Evaluation of Work Product or Activity.*

Discuss such factors as quality, scope and quantity of work, initiative and resourcefulness demonstrated, general usability or appropriateness of the effort, significant contributions which may have resulted, and similar factors as indicated. Consider opportunities existing at the post. Consider whether statistical and other types of information are readily available or whether considerable initiative and ingenuity are required to secure even basic information. Attach supplementary sheets if required.

#### C. *Rating Assigned.*

The rating is to be assigned in terms of six (6) levels, six (6) represents the highest rating, one (1) the lowest. Using the following standards encircle on the face of this form that number which best reflects the level of the officer's or employee's performance with reference to the type of work or activity reported on. The narrative evaluation under part B should justify the rating assigned. Ratings should be confined to an evaluation of the reports or other work products submitted without reference to the class level of the officer or employee.

1. - The work product or performance was deficient in many important respects and clearly below acceptable standards.
2. - The work product or performance although acceptable and usable was deficient in several important respects.
3. - The work product or performance was satisfactory.
4. - The work product or performance was more than satisfactory indicating considerable initiative and resourcefulness.
5. - The work product or performance was so exceptionally well done as to leave no recognizable room for improvement in any significant respect.
6. - The work product or performance was superior in every respect denoting the highest degree of resourcefulness and initiative with no recognizable room for possible improvement.

#### D. *Disposition of Form.*

Completed forms should be submitted to the Department of State, Division of Foreign Service Personnel, Performance Measurement Branch.

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

E. Statistics

Although the total number of summaries completed by analysts has increased appreciably -- from 366 in FY 1956 to 476 in FY 1957 -- there still remains wide room for improvement. (For example, there were approximately 976 reporting officers in FY 1957 on whom summaries should have been prepared.) One reason for this failure to evaluate more than 48% of the reporting officers may have been that analysts were reluctant to prepare summaries on officers whose reporting was unsatisfactory. Failure to evaluate the work of all reporting officers through the preparation of end-user summaries is not only unfair to the officers concerned but denies pertinent information to the Selection Boards. Therefore, analysts should cooperate as fully as possible in making the program a success.

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

9

## VI - ICD'S ANNUAL EVALUATION OF FOREIGN SERVICE REPORTING

Each year ICD prepares a survey of Foreign Service political, economic and biographic reporting, and foreign publications procurement from the intelligence viewpoint. The report measures the post's performance in relation to reasonable intelligence needs for information, with an indication in broad terms of existing deficiencies. The post's over-all performance is considered, rather than that of individual officers.

### A. Preparation

1. Written Statements by Analysts. During late November and early December of each year, the Requirements Staff of ICD requests the analysts in IRA and the Division of Biographic Information (BI) to write an evaluative statement for each post covering specific items listed in an outline prepared by ICD. Views also are solicited from CIA, USIA and the military intelligence organizations. The evaluative statements should be returned (in 3 copies) to the Requirements Staff of ICD before the indicated deadline.
2. Comments by Desk Officers. A copy of the IRA - BI evaluative statement, in draft, is sent to appropriate desk officers for comment before an indicated deadline. In the great majority of cases, desk officers will concur in the draft evaluations. In those cases where disagreements are substantial in nature, efforts will be made to resolve the differences through meetings arranged by the Requirements Staff of ICD. Unresolvable differences of opinion will be indicated in the final evaluation.
3. Comments by the Foreign Reporting Staff (REP). Although REP does not appear as a collaborating member in the evaluation, either by reference in the text, or in the instruction transmitting it to the posts, a draft of IRA's evaluative statements is sent by the Requirements Staff of ICD to REP for comments within a prescribed time limit. REP's comments are considered in the preparation of the final evaluation.

### B. Purpose Served by the Annual Evaluation

The annual evaluation serves 5 basic purposes:

1. It constitutes an annual record, post by post, of Foreign Service performance in meeting a large part of the Department's obligations to the intelligence community in the overt collection field.
2. It is the foundation for a summary which constitutes the Foreign Service collection portion of the intelligence community's annual report to the National Security Council on the status of the foreign intelligence program.

OFFICIAL USE ONLY



3. It provides data which is used in the collection portion of the semiannual portion of the semiannual INR report to the Hull Committee and in INR's contributions to the Foreign Service Inspectors' Briefing Books.
4. It supplies to the geographic bureaus information for budget justifications, funds allocation planning, personnel complement planning, and training programs.
5. It affords general guidance and information to all field posts concerning their contributions to the intelligence reporting program.

C. Distribution of the Annual Evaluation

The annual evaluation is distributed widely in the Department (see Appendix B for list of Departmental recipients outside the INR area). In addition, (under cover of an instruction), ICD transmits to diplomatic posts and to some consular posts those sections of the evaluation which relate to their areas. These instructions stress the fact that while Foreign Service reporting has been evaluated by INR from the intelligence viewpoint, regional bureaus have contributed to the evaluation in order to broaden its base.

INR believes that the evaluations, in pointing up deficient as well as satisfactory reporting, will aid the posts in their efforts to meet the Department's intelligence needs.

Copies of previous annual evaluations are filed in the office of the Requirements Staff of ICD.

## VII - INSPECTORS' BRIEFING BOOK CONTRIBUTIONS

The Requirements Staff of ICD is notified of forthcoming inspections of posts by the Foreign Service Inspection Corps. It then requests IRA, BI, and LR within INR to submit contributions for the Inspectors' Briefing Books. ICD/FP is also asked to comment on the adequacy of foreign publications procurement. The contributions are edited in the Requirements Staff and sent directly to the Reports and Operations Staff (S/S-RO) in the Office of the Under Secretary (U). Other bureaus or agencies are not asked to comment on INR contributions. It is believed that the Inspectors will benefit most if they have an independent appraisal of a post's reporting from INR's point of view. Analysts are therefore encouraged to express their views with the utmost frankness.

IRA and BI analysts are requested to make an over-all evaluation, from the intelligence standpoint, of the post's political, economic and biographic reporting since the last inspection. Points usually considered and commented upon include: (1) adequacy of information reported and soundness of evaluations of such information by reporting officers; (2) backlog of work in political, economic and biographic reporting in response to specific instructions; and (3) suggestions for improving the efficiency of the reporting activities of the post. For further details see INR Administrative Circular No. 14, dated September 12, 1957, "Preparation of R Contributions to the Inspectors' Briefing Books".

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

### VIII - CONCLUSIONS

The key to a successful program of appraisals and evaluations is a large volume of appraisals of individual despatches. Analysts will find that the preparation of Annual End-User Summary reports, Contributions to Inspector's Briefing Books, Joint Weeka, and Annual Evaluation of Foreign Service reporting will be made easier if they maintain a steady flow of individual despatch appraisals during the year.

Inspectors state that more appraisals and evaluations are needed to guide reporting officers and to stimulate them to greater and more thoughtful effort. They also believe that constructive criticism of poor reports, tactfully presented, will improve field reporting and increase an officer's usefulness to the Foreign Service.

Although the volume of appraisals and evaluations of individual despatches and the number of end-user summaries have been increasing, a still greater effort is needed to make the program a complete success. It is hoped that this handbook will assist and encourage analysts to increase the output and improve the quality of appraisals and evaluations.

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

13

APPENDIX A

The following regulations and circulars bear on the appraisal and evaluation program:

1. Section 533.24 of the Regulations and Procedures Manual touches upon general aspects of the appraisal and evaluation work.
2. INR Administrative Circular No. 42 of April 1, 1958, presents procedures to be followed in INR in the appraisal and evaluation program and assigns coordination responsibility to ICD.
3. Department Circular No. 194 of March 23, 1956, urges Departmental officers to prepare more appraisals of economic reporting because of recommendations by Foreign Service Inspectors.
4. Department Circular No. 224 of October 4, 1956, encourages end-users to increase the number of appraisals and end-user summary reports and describes their importance.
5. 3 FSM 062.22 authorizes posts to request appraisals of economic despatches.
6. 4 FSM 266 describes the purpose of appraisals of political despatches and authorizes posts to request appraisals.
7. CA-5740, dated January 18, 1957, authorizes a post to request an appraisal of any given political despatch.
8. IRA Circular Memorandum of May 21, 1956, prepared by the Director of the Office of Intelligence Research and Analysis, requests analysts to submit more appraisals.

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

APPENDIX B

The incumbents of the following positions are recipients of the "Annual Evaluation of Foreign Service Reporting."

Deputy Under Secretary for Administration  
Director General, Foreign Service  
Inspector General, Foreign Service

Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs  
Executive Director, Bureau of Inter-American Affairs

Assistant Secretary for European Affairs  
Executive Director, Bureau of European Affairs

Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs  
Executive Director, Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs

Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs  
Executive Director, Bureau of Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs

Assistant Secretary for African Affairs  
Executive Director, Bureau of African Affairs

Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs  
Executive Director, Bureau of International Organization Affairs

Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs

Assistant Secretary for Administration  
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Budget and Finance  
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Personnel  
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Operations  
Director, Foreign Reporting Staff

Approved For Release 2002/05/23 : CIA-RDP81S00991R000200030010-8

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Approved For Release 2002/05/23 : CIA-RDP81S00991R000200030010-8

OFFICIAL USE ONLY